

REMARKS AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On June 7, 2005, Applicants' attorney telephoned Examiner Hardee to discuss the present case. During such discussion, Examiner Hardee stated that if the independent claims of the present application were amended to include the limitations of Claim 27, Applicants complied with the restriction requirement, and the double patenting objections were overcome, the claims of the present case would be allowable.

Applicants contend that the amended claims of the present application include the limitations of Claim 27 and are in compliance with the restriction requirement. Furthermore, as Applicants are submitting two (2) terminal disclaimers with this response, Applicants contend that the March 31, 2005, Office Action's double patenting rejections are overcome.

In summary, Claims 21-26 and 28-35 are pending in the present application. Claim 27 was canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-20 were previously cancelled by preliminary amendment. Claims 21, 22, 23, 25 and 30 have been amended. Support for such amendments can be found in the original claims and, for example, pages 14-17 of the specification.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The March 31, 2005, Office Action states that the restriction requirement is final. Applicants claims are restricted to Groups VI and VII. Applicants claims therefore require the presence of an amino functional component selected from the group consisting aminoalkyl piperazine, derivatives of aminoalkyl piperazine, linear N,N'-bis-(3-aminopropyl)-1,3-propanediamine, branched N,N'-bis-(3-aminopropyl)-1,3-propanediamine and mixtures thereof.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS

Applicants contend that the terminal disclaimers that are submitted with this response (one for the provisional double patenting rejections and one for the nonprovisional double patenting rejection) overcome the double patenting rejections found in the March 31, 2005, Office Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants contend that the amendments to Claim 22 obviate the aforementioned rejection of such claim as the point of rejection has been deleted from such claim.

Appl. No. 10/716,297
Atty. Docket No. CM1924MCC
Amdt. Dated March 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2005
Customer No. 27752

ART REJECTIONS

As noted in the Remarks and Interview Summary, Examiner Hardee stated that if the independent claims of the present application were amended to include the limitations of Claim 27, Applicants complied with the restriction requirement, and the double patenting objections were overcome, the claims of the present case would be allowable.


Applicants contend that, as Applicants' independent claims now include the limitations of Claim 27, the art rejections found in the March 31, 2005, Office Action have been overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and allowance of the Claims 21-26 and 28-35.

Respectfully submitted,
Bettiol et al.

By



James F. Mc Bride
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,784
(513) 627-0079

June 23, 2005
Customer No. 27752